UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

A Letter to the Children of All Nations

By ZONA GALE

What Is Wrong With the Labor Injunction?

By T. RICHARD WITMER

Sketches of the Indian Revolution

By MIRA

How to Find God

By J. T. SUNDERLAND

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 14

Chicago, December 15, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JOSEPH LL. JONES, Janesville. G. W. WESTON, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, • Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., • } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Special Announcement!

DEVERE ALLEN

Editor of "The World Tomorrow" is now in Europe and is preparing a series of six articles on

"European and International Conditions"

These articles will appear in "Unity" at intervals during the coming winter.

Mr. Allen has long been a student of international affairs, is a leader of pacifist thought in this country, and will write of European conditions as he sees them at first hand in England, France and Germany.

Subscribe Now! *$3.00 per year*

Unity Publishing Company

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 211
A Letter to the Children of All Nations—ZONA GALE 213
Jottings—J. H. H. 214

ARTICLES—

Sketches of the Indian Revolution—MIRA 214
American Notes—Some Church Leaders: V—Dr. Stephen S. Wise—SYDNEY STRONG 215
What Is Wrong With the Labor Injunctions?—T. RICHARD WITMER 216
How to Find God—J. T. SUNDERLAND 217
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part VI 218

POETRY—

So Simple—*Stopford A. Brooke* 211

THE STUDY TABLE—

An Englishman on India—L. M. G. 219

CORRESPONDENCE—

Britain, Palestine, and India—TARAKNATH DAS 222
A Personal Word from Gandhi—MIRA 223
Thoughts of Tolstoy—SHEED ANDERSON 223

THE FIELD—

Two Australian Prophets 223

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930 NUMBER 14

SO SIMPLE

A little sun, a little rain,
A soft wind blowing from the west—
And woods and fields are sweet again,
And warmth within the mountain's breast.
So simple is the earth we tread,
So quick with love and life her frame,
Ten thousand years have dawned and fled,
And still her magic is the same.

A little love, a little trust,
A soft impulse, a sudden dream,
And life as dry as desert dust
Is fresher than a mountain stream.
So simple is the heart of man,
So ready for new hope and joy;
Ten thousand years since it began
Have left it younger than a boy.

—Stopford A. Brooke.

It would be a mean, Scrooge-like soul which begrudged anybody the pride and joy which must come from the winning of a Nobel Prize. We congratulate Secretary Kellogg, who recently was granted the 1929 Peace Prize, and Archbishop Soederblom, of Sweden, who was at the same time granted the 1930 prize. Dr. Soederblom especially pleases us, as this distinguished churchman is one of the mighty men whom Scandinavia seems to find it not difficult to breed. Furthermore, we like the recognition of the fact that the church, not less than the state, can be effective in the cause of peace. As for Secretary Kellogg, we feel a sense of vindication in the thought that this American citizen has thus been honored because of his part in the work of formulating the great pact for the Outlawry of War. As among the first to espouse the cause of Outlawry, we find an impressive endorsement of our cause in this action of the Nobel Committee. Yet, just because of this fact, do we find also a certain failure of exact justice in this matter. Undoubtedly the world owes much to Frank B. Kellogg for what he did for the Pact of Paris, but it owes more, far more, if it only knew it, to the man who first conceived the idea of Outlawry, toiled for it in season and out when nobody would listen, and at last carried it to Washington where the late Secretary of State picked it up and carried it to Paris. Salmon O. Levinson should have received the Nobel Prize for 1929, as posterity will surely agree. What has misled the committee here is the glamor of official office. This same glamor deceived the committee when it conferred the prize, years ago, on Theodore Roosevelt, and, still more, when it bestowed it on Charles G. Dawes. If official position must be the decisive point, it is at least true that Mr. Kellogg deserves the Peace Prize more fully than any other American who has ever received it. But behind him today, and far above him tomorrow, looms the figure of Mr. Levinson. To him be the praise!

If American history shows an instance of more consummate arrogance than that manifested by President Green of the American Federation of Labor, in his opposition to the appointment of Mr. William Doak to the Secretaryship of Labor, we do not happen to know what it is. The "cheek" of it surpasses anything we can remember, or even imagine. Mr. Doak, it should be said, is a perfectly good labor man, being long and honorably identified with the great Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. But the Brotherhood is not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor—it dares to be independent!—and President Green declares that the labor post in the cabinet belongs to the Federation. After catching our breath, we find ourselves wondering a bit. On this theory, does the Treasurership belong to the bankers of the country? What would be said if the admirals insisted upon dictating the appointment to the leadership of the Navy Department? And try to imagine, if you can, what kind of clamor would be lifted if the Anti-Saloon League attempted to control the naming of the Attorney-General, who incidentally has charge of Prohibition enforcement. The gall of the American Federation, its brazen impudence in making this claim to control a great government department as a mere adjunct of its own private organization, is, of course, thoroughly characteristic of Green, Woll and Co., men whose egotism is in exact proportion to their stupidity. But it is unique in the fact that it gives opportunity for rebuke of which President Hoover has wisely and courageously availed himself. We can think of no act of Mr. Hoover which stands more surely to his credit than the appointment of Mr. Doak as a slap in the face of Mr. Green. That the country will rally to the President's support, and the Senate confirm his appointment, goes without saying.

In what we have said about Mr. Doak in the above editorial, we have been speaking from the standpoint

of the situation precipitated by President Green of the American Federation of Labor. For Mr. Doak himself, on his own merits, we must now confess we have no enthusiasm. On the contrary, as President Hoover did a right thing in rebuking the impudence of Mr. Green, so we believe he did a wrong thing in selecting Mr. Doak as the particular man to occupy the high office of Secretary of Labor. To begin with, Mr. Doak is identified with the aristocracy of the labor world. His predecessor, Mr. Davis, was similarly identified, for the American Federation of Labor, exactly like the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, comprises the upper crust of labor society. We believe the time has come when the President of this nation should recognize that the great mass of labor in this country is not represented by these two exclusive and selfish organizations, and that some wider and farther vision of industrial emancipation than any representative of these organizations can offer is sorely needed. But there is more serious objection to William Doak as a member of the President's Cabinet. This objection springs from his attitude toward the Negro question, which is as intolerant and therefore intolerable as the attitude of Judge Parker, whose appointment to the bench of the Supreme Court was defeated on this one issue. As long ago as last March the *Crisis,* edited by W. E. B. DuBoise, published the record of Mr. Doak as follows:

> William Doak was for a long time an employee in the great railroad yards of the city of Bluefield, West Virginia, and in his official capacity, there was no one more active and more determined to remove all Negro employees from the railroad than Mr. Doak. He left there and went to Roanoke, Virginia, and there maintained this attitude of hostility. It was not simply that he kept Negroes out of his Union. According to the constitution of the Union, of which he is Vice-President, no person of Negro descent, no matter what his ability, character, or training has been, can ever be a member of the Railroad Trainmen's Union. But this is not enough for Mr. Doak. In addition to that, he has tried to see to it that every decent way of earning bread and butter on the part of Negroes, so far as railways are concerned, shall be cut off."

We agree with the editor of the *Crisis* that "to put a man of this kind in the Cabinet as Secretary of Labor would be the grimmest joke ever perpetrated at the expense of a long suffering people." We profoundly regret that President Hoover's courageous resistance of the arrogant dictation of the American Federation of Labor was exercised on behalf of so unworthy an appointee.

A woman in labor is apparently having an easy time of it as compared with the Wickersham Committee. The long-postponed report of this committee may be borne at any time now, we imagine—perhaps before this editorial can appear—but if signs mean anything, much travail is still in prospect, with nothing to show for it, perhaps, until New Years, or even later. Meanwhile, the excitement of a prospective father in the waiting-room of a maternity hospital is only a faint suggestion of the excitement of politicians and the public generally over the report, especially the Prohibition section. Yet we are ourselves so naive, so moronic, that we cannot conceive why anybody should feel even a feather's flutter over what Mr. Wickersham and his associates may say. For whatever this may be, it will make no more impression upon the present situation than a drop of water falling on a red-hot stove. There will be a sound, as of something explosive, then the report, like the drop of water, will be gone, and the red-hot stove of conflicting opinion will blaze on. The Wickersham report, in other words, is a matter of just exactly no importance whatsoever. This may be as disgraceful a fact as you please, but it happens also to be the *fact.* Which means that President Hoover is never going to get anywhere, certainly not on this issue of Prohibition, with the commission method of procedure! What is needed on this issue, and on the peace issue, and on the economic issue, is heroic moral leadership. Data? We have more data than we can digest! But clear vision as to the nature of the evils we are combating—stalwart courage in the fighting of these evils—a conscience, a will, and a creative mind—all these are sadly lacking. The Wickersham Committee could be important if it "hewed to the line, letting the chips fall where they may." But committees don't do this sort of thing. We paltered and faltered on the slavery issue—and now we are doing the same on the liquor issue. What a shame!

The unexpected appearance of the name of Col. T. H. Lawrence in the trial of the eight treasonable engineers in Moscow shows clearly the real character of this amazing Englishman. Ever since his Arabian exploits in the Great War, Lawrence has been the object of fascinating mystery and fulsome adulation. But time has passed, and the mystery has begun to wear thin and the adulation to turn sour. This Moscow revelation would seem to tear away the last rag of romance from one of the shoddiest heroes that the Great War produced. For Lawrence is not a hero at all. He postures and poses like a hero—he puts on disguises, hides away, appears again, like some Arabian Night's demigod—he lives in a legend, carefully created and cultivated by himself, which is one of the sagas of modern times. But at bottom he is nothing more nor less than a professional trouble-maker, infinitely useful to the British Crown. The mystery and the romance are only part of the game! Lawrence began his work in Arabia, where in the interest of England in the Great War he aroused the Arabs against their Turkish overlords, and incidentally made promises on behalf of the Empire which are the basis of most of the woe which has befallen Palestine during the last decade. After the War, Lawrence made one of his dramatic disappearances. But report soon found him in India, living under an assumed name, and of course, leading in the work of sowing dissension among the Indians and fomenting outbreaks among the

Afghans, to the greater power of the Empire in these stolen lands. Now he bobs up in Russia, still engaged in the disreputable business of making trouble. There is, of course, widespread suspicion of the validity of the testimony in the great treason trial in Moscow, and feverish denials have been made by all the governments and many of the persons incriminated. To us, the stories seem in the highest degree fantastic. But Col. Lawrence's name gives instant credibility to the whole affair.

There was a touch of the sublime about Mother Jones, dead on November 25th, last, in the 101st year of her age. She was ignorant, vulgar, profane, but she had a love for the common people, a sensitiveness to their wrongs, a consciousness of their rights, and a heroism and sacrifice on their behalf, which lifted her into the company of the great. A contemporary of Eugene V. Debs, she showed, like him, how sure is the conquest of the heart over the head. Debs, of course, had an intellectual capacity, as well as a training in the theory of radical economics, which Mother Jones never had. He had a command also of the multitudes, and a political sagacity and genius, which Mother Jones could not rival. But it was the love of his heart for the weak and the down-trodden, and a willingness to identify his life with that of the most wretched of mankind, which made Debs immortal, and here Mother Jones walked side by side with him in comradeship. What a life this woman lived. She, herself, did not know, we imagine, how many strikes she had fought, how many arrests she had endured, how many imprisonments she had served. She could have rivalled Paul in her catalogue of suffering! But nothing daunted her, defeated her, or disgraced her. She rose triumphant over every pain, and proved again how helpless is government when it has nothing but force and violence to wield against the valor of the heart. In her old age, we are told, Mother Jones softened. Nothing could be farther from the truth. She had simply put off her armor, her battles at last done, and thus disclosed to all the essential tenderness which she had lavished through the years upon her "boys," the workers. What wonder that she came everywhere to be known as "Mother"! Her heart was a mother's heart opened not merely to the children of his own flesh, but to the people whom Jesus and Lincoln loved. She fought fiercely but never bitterly, uncompromisingly, but never cruelly. The saint was in her, as well as the warrior, and she died among the blessed of her time.

A Letter to the Children of All Nations

You live at a time when the world is waiting.

Once the world was settled in its habit of adjusting social differences by means of physical wounds and bloodshed. Later there were those who talked of removing causes of war. Now we know that causes for social difference may arise in families, in business, on the playground, among nations, and in every form of human relationship. But we know, also, that deliberately to deal out death and disfigurement and physical disability in order to effect a settlement is as absurd for nations as it would be for a school board meeting, or for any board of directors, or on a field day.

Life is not like that!

Life is a process in which reason, good nature and humane practices constitute the basic rule. When we are unreasonable or destructive or cruel, we are not regarding the rule, we are not playing the game. War is not playing the game. In the use of poison gas, of air-bombing, of the blockade, war now uses means so opposed to rule, so unsportsmanlike, that no field day, no boxing match, no business could employ their like.

War is deliberate cruelty and destruction and death. War has out-moded itself. It stands outside every decent ruling for human behavior. The world knows this well, and now it is waiting for the next way, the new way. The way which the boys and girls of today shall be bringing to pass tomorrow!

Thirteen years ago the world knew well its lesson. By thirteen years from now, the boys and girls of today will be men and women, putting this lesson in practice. And the lesson is that war is the last refuge of social incompetence and "the sum of all villainies."

For life is not deliberate cruelty, or destruction, or death. Life is something more than that which we believe it to be. Life is an exercise in the improvement of human relationship.

George Washington was a general in a Revolutionary Army, but this is what he said:

> My first wish is to see the whole world in peace and the inhabitants as one band of brothers, striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind.

This should be the first wish of humanity and of common sense alike. Wisdom and reason can ask no more, but they should ask no less. Millions left on battlefields, thousands crippled and broken, towns ruined, homes gone, the depths of suffering endured—is this wisdom or reason? There is no greater conceivable wisdom for nations than the outlawry of war. Without it trade and production and science and civilization may become nothing. Peace is not impossible in your lifetime. Everything is a thought first. Trade was a thought before it was trade. The outlawry of war is a thought yet. The men and women of to-

morrow will make that thought their reality. For all human beings are bound together by ties which the nations must cease to break. The people are met together on earth for their world-work, which war must cease to interrupt. The basic business of life is to conserve life and to promote growth. Life is an exercise in the improvement of human relationship.

ZONA GALE.

Jottings

Prime Minister MacDonald sits in the House of Commons, he presides at the Indian Round Table Conference, he conducts the Cabinet, he makes speeches, attends public meetings, receives important visitors. . . We wonder what he does in between times!

We noticed recently in the "Social News" of the New York *Times* an account of the celebration of an anniversary of a church. Wise editor! He knows that most churches are social institutions, and have little to do with religion.

The skill and determination of American autoists are beyond compare. Thus, on a certain railroad which runs only *one train a day,* an automobile hit a grade-crossing just in time for a collision. The man who drove that machine should be rewarded as the champion marksman of the world.

A correspondent writes us: "India can never be free, for God has put her in bondage to Britain." We are glad that this man recognizes that India's relation to Britain is "bondage." But the faculty with which such people blame such things on God never ceases to amaze us.

A Fundamentalist preacher has recently declared that a man cannot be moral if he is *not* a Christian. In view of a million things going on in our so-called Christian civilization these days, we are sometimes tempted to believe that a man cannot be moral if he *is* a Christian.

We would have blamed Herbert Hoover if he had failed to submit the World Court protocol to this session of Congress. We would now praise him that he has done so.

J. H. H.

Sketches of the Indian Revolution

I. The Women

The bright stars of the night were just beginning to pale before the approaching dawn, when the sound of girls' voices singing drew us to the Ashram gate. We knew what it meant and hurried to give the farewell greeting. Today two batches of women and girls were to go to Borsad, to work amongst the peasantry of Kaira. Away they went, the first batch, before the rising of the sun—and the second batch went in the afternoon.

All through the life of the Ashram the training of the women and girls for service of the people has been one of Gandhiji's most cherished works.

During these days the fruit of that work has ripened and dropped into the hands of the nation.

In the early days of the struggle the majority of the elder women headed by Kasturbai (Mrs. Gandhi) left the Ashram to go picketing and today almost all the young girls with a few remaining elder women have gone forth.

We are but a handful left, and even that handful may yet go.

As with the Ashram, so is it with the whole of India. The women have heard and understood. Gandhiji's years of loving service in their cause has formed between him and them a sacred bond, and today all the faith and ardor of their womanly nature is being poured into the struggle.

From the day I entered the Ashram I felt in it the key to this bond.

II. Arrested

In the fading evening light I saw her approaching —a baby in her arms and two or three more little children clustering round her. She was quietly taking them as usual for their evening stroll. The little ones running by her side were chattering excitedly, but she was as peaceful as the evening sky.

"So the police came today?" I said.

"Yes," she replied gently, "they have taken him away again."

"What a lesson to us, is this quiet strength and fredom from resentment!" I reflected to myself as I went my way.

Sjt. Valjibhai Desai has been arrested for the second time.

III. The Night

Silence and solitude reign in the little garden where Gandhiji used to come to rest at night. No one is left but myself to sleep there now.

In the silver moonlight the motionless trees stand round—They seem plunged in endless meditation—a long train of past memories fills the air, and the stars and moon whisper from the skies that *he* is there sleeping in the prison yard, and they can see him.

The peace of the Eternal in the midst of the battle.

God help us to grasp and hold that peace, for it is the strength which no wordly power can overcome.

Sabarmati, India. MIRA.*

*"Mira" is the Indian name of an English woman, friend of Gandhi, and staunch champion of the Nationalist cause.—EDITOR.

American Notes

Some Church Leaders—V

Sherwood Eddy is one of Dr. Stephen S. Wise's "Ten Church Leaders." He spoke Sunday morning, November 30, in Carnegie Hall, New York, on "India and Gandhi." This is Dr. Wise's own congregation, he being laid on the shelf for a few weeks with the common American malady—taking on the last straw that breaks the camel's back. Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein officiated in his absence. He is an excellent, first-mate captain.

Several dramatic features caught my fancy while I was waiting for the opening of the service. Here were a Jew and Christian collaborating in doing honor to one who is a Hindu and in jail. (Has anyone written a book on "Some Great Prisoners? From Socrates to Gandhi"?) Was there ever a great man who was not in prison? Sherwood Eddy, a Christian, speaking about the wonderful saint, Gandhi! I felt assured that he would not have said what he did if he had not recognized in Gandhi as a parallel his own supreme loyalty—Jesus of Nazareth. And when he was pleading with his brothers, the British, to follow Gandhi and not to harden their hearts, it was to him a modern interpretation of the story of Jesus of Nazareth passing by—the portrayal of one, Gandhi, who carried salvation for the Empire. Historians will so interpret this chapter of British history—Gandhi could save them. "If Britain is wise! If MacDonald has the courage! If Gandhi is heeded! India will stay in the Empire with Dominion status, like Canada!"

Mr. Eddy spent fifteen years in India in the first part of this century. Since that period it has been his practice to visit India every five years. During the past year he visited Gandhi at the time of the meeting of the National Congress and the historic march to the Sea. Thus few are better equipped to speak of India and Gandhi. He has been for years a much sought speaker to college youth. For ten years past he has been conducting "Seminars" through the countries of Europe, in which a large number of "key-men" of America have participated. Few men know the leaders of the capitals of Europe better than Mr. Eddy. All of which gave him a strong support as he arose to speak! Here are some of the ideas that dropped from his lips, energized by a certain persuasive emotional tone he possesses:

India is burning with a new unity—one of passionate national enthusiasm. The Round Table in London is facing an almost unparalleled task, that of making a constitution. We must face the difficulties: over 300,000,000 people in one-half the space of the United States; dialects, 222 in number; castes and sub-castes, 4,000! *Yet, now India is a unit!*

Mr. Eddy said he was not neutral, but sympathetic. Britain has a strong case. She has given India a *Pax Britannica*. She has built 40,000 miles of excellent railway, put in irrigation, 26 million acres, pupils in her schools, 11,000,000. Britain says that India is now asking for liberty that has been taught in her schools! India's reply is, Good government is no substitute for self-government. There is always moral deterioration under a foreign yoke. Under Britain India is the poorest country in the world. The average income is eight cents a day. Native trade has been injured. The farmers are idle one hundred days in the year. In school there is only one child in five. Enormous salaries go to British officials, from the Viceroy ($40,000) down. The cost of the Viceroy's houses is $40,000,000. The army for defense is the most costly in the world.

Mr. Eddy said he could find not one leader in India who was willing to go on as now. The Spirit of 1776 is blazing out everywhere. India is in revolution, yet Britain does not know it. India is demanding a status, like Canada; or else independence, like the United States.

Why this change? At the close of the War several things occurred that aroused the people. India had been promised much for her loyalty. The Rowlatt Acts were a slap in the face. The brutal massacre of Amritsar, under General Dyer, shocked not only India but the world. A tide of revolt began to rise. In 1921, 30,000 men and women were in jail. Miss Mayo's book,—"the most unfair book I ever read," helped to stiffen the backbone of the "die-hards" in Britain. Then came the declaration for independence, and India was, and is, aflame. An ever-present cause of friction is the galling "superiority" of the British. Mr. Eddy told the story of Nehru—a man of highest culture and inheritance, his despicable treatment by the "superior" invaders of his country—a "man of the purest blood in the world" being socially "blackballed" by the Anglo-Saxon, in Nehru's own land! It had become intolerable, and India was in revolt.

Enters Gandhi, the leader of the revolt of India! His weapon is non-violence. This is his method for throwing off the British yoke, and also for social reconstruction. His philosophy is: You must never acquiesce in wrong-doing or be passive in the face of evil; you must never strike back or resist evil with evil; you must always stand up aggressively for righteousness and resist evil with good, and take the consequences. His opposition to British rule is on the ground that the system is evil. Gandhi tried his method for twenty years in Africa, and by it won the comparative freedom of his people there. He has transferred the same method to India. Mr. Eddy had an interview with the Viceroy, Irwin, whom he calls a "great soul," but adds, "these two can never get together."

Some of Gandhi's customs attracted Mr. Eddy's attention. Gandhi rigorously keeps a "day of silence"—from 7 p. m. Sunday to 7 p. m. Monday. He rises at 4 a. m. He seems resolved to "make the faith of the world his own." Every day at 7:30 p. m. he observes a half-hour of prayer, no matter what affairs of state press attention. In a public meeting, he always sits at the back of the platform. "He is a great soul, that lives in God, and moves about in the world." Said Mr. Eddy, "I have seen many great leaders, but have never seen such a soul in man. To me he seems to be three men in one: Buddha, St. Francis and Thomas Jefferson. Wherever he goes, he is followed by the people, the multitude, and upon their faces shines the light of worship. The people flock to *see* Gandhi, even more than to *hear* him. They are content if they can only *see* him, but touch the hem of his garment. On his face they see the light that never shone on land or sea."

SYDNEY STRONG.

What is Wrong With the Labor Injunction?

Several events within the past year or so have served to call to the public's attention the fact that the problem of the labor injunction has not yet been solved. Among these events we may note as examples the nomination of Judge Parker to the Supreme Court by President Hoover and the Senate's rejection of that nomination, the publication by Professor Frankfurter and Mr. Greene of their book on "The Labor Injunction," the adverse decision given the so-called Shipstead bill by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the announcement by the Civil Liberties Union that it will undertake a fight to put that bill through. In view of these events it may not be out of place to consider briefly the objections to the use of the injunction in labor disputes. This is the aim of this article.

In the main, these objections to the labor injunction may be summed up under three headings: (1) the end sought by the injunction, (2) the means employed to gain that end, and (3) the men who administer the injunction.

These may well be expanded somewhat. First, then, as to the objections to the end sought by the use of the injunction. It is labor's contention that in a *laissez-faire* system such as we now have, the only protection afforded the individual worker lies in his associating himself with his fellows and acting with them in concert. Thus, in order to secure a better standard of living for himself—which is, in the end, what higher wages and shorter hours mean—he agrees that the union shall be empowered to speak for him and, if necessary, to adopt such tactics as will best procure that end. These tactics ordinarily include strikes, picketing, unfair lists and boycotts. It is understood, of course, that these are only means to ends, but even so most of them—particularly the last three—fall under the ban of the injunction when they are used vigorously and the whole program of the unions as a consequence often fails to the detriment not only of the organized workers but of workers as a whole. This is what is understood when it is said that the use of the injunction in labor disputes is unfair as to the end sought—it precludes the use by labor of its most effective weapons.

Part of the trouble here lies in the fact that to the courts the odor of conspiracy still lingers about labor organizations even though they have been declared not to be conspiracies by Congress and many state legislatures. Too, the courts commonly argue that an action may be illegal either because of the end pursued or because of the means employed to gain that end. The impossibility of demonstrating completely that concerted action, such as a strike or picketing, is entirely intended to attain legal ends, such as better pay or hours of work, and not at all to coerce the employer either directly or indirectly through threats of violence or intimidation, which are the usual standards the courts use in judging the legality or means, is quite apparent, for the criteria used by the courts, under the guidance of the Supreme Court, in determining whether violence or intimidation have been employed, are so stringent that no successful campaign can possibly be carried on by a labor union without the likelihood of its being broken up by injunction.

The second objection to the use of the injunction in labor disputes involves the means employed by the courts in issuing and enforcing injunction orders. This is, in essence, a protest against procedure in equity in such cases as these. Labor is willing enough to admit that strikes, picketing, boycotts, and unfair lists, even as means to ends, ought not to be used indiscriminately and that some sort of control should be exercised by the supposedly disinterested third party, the government. But labor does object to having this control exercised by persons totally irresponsible to the electorate. The fact that ordinarily the violation of an injunctive order is not tried as in ordinary criminal cases by a jury, but by a judge alone who is usually the same judge who originally issued the injunction and who, accordingly, may reasonably be presumed to be interested in its strict enforcement, does not lend any more sense of responsibility to the proceedings so far as labor can see. Add to this the fact that injunctions are often issued *ex parte,* that "temporary" injunctions are often continued for months, that in the preliminary proceedings testimony is taken by affidavits instead of by direct confrontation of witnesses, that the phrasing of the orders is vague and ambiguous, and that these are addressed often to unnamed parties, and it is easy to realize the force of this second contention that the courts' means of issuing and enforcing injunctions are palpably unfair.

The third point is even more important than these other two because it is much less tangible. It is the objection to the kind of man entrusted with the administration of the injunctive power. Some claim that the usual judge is actively prejudiced against labor. This is denied by others who still see the courts as the acme of purity. Whatever the merit of these claims, however, it is still reasonable to believe on the one hand that the ordinary judge's habits of thought are unconsciously identified with corporations and propertied interests, and on the other that he has not the training in the social sciences requisite for an intelligent understanding of this sort of case. That is to say that the lawyers are, for the most part, first of all recruited from the middle classes; they are next sent through law schools in which little emphasis is put on economic considerations in law and in which the predominant mood is an appeal to authority and tradition; and finally when the time comes to select judges from the members of the bar it is the successful lawyer who is picked—and the successful lawyer today is the corporation lawyer. All of this tends to guarantee conservatism on the bench, with which is too often coupled a complete ignorance of what industrial relations are all about from the workers' standpoint.

While all these objections are valid, none of them is fundamental from the standpoint of legal theory. From this point of view, the objection to the labor injunction resolves itself into the statement that this is the use of an extraordinary remedy in an ordinary situation. This, in the end, sums up all the other objections, but it does so with more regard for the importance of comprehensive statement and legal principles than do any of the others. A fuller statement of this proposition is perhaps in order.

The injunction, as is well known, is an equitable instrument. As such, one of the prime requisites for its

use is either that there shall be no adequate remedy at law which can be appealed to, or that the law will actually work an injury if it is carried out. Either of these considerations makes it clear that equity is to be resorted to only in an emergency. This is substantiated by a knowledge of its historical development. It grew up alongside of the common law as a means of preventing injustice from being done by the law or by lack of law on a subject. It was first particularly the king's prerogative to issue injunctions since he was the source of all justice; from him it passed on to the chancellor and from him to regularly constituted courts of equity.

That this is a wise division of the subject matter of law and equity is backed up by a consideration of the facts of the case. Obviously, the laws cannot take into consideration every possible event or contingency; obviously, also, the strict application of an out-of-date law or one not intended to apply to a given case may work an injustice. In such events as these a more flexible system of justice must be devised. It is this end that equity is designed to fill.

On the other hand, when a subject becomes sufficiently common to allow laws to be made governing it, that subject is no longer properly within the purview of equity, but should become a part of the statutory law of the community, and the judges should be bound by that law. That is to say that *while the principles of equity should remain constant its subject matter should be variable.* Law is supposed to be the crystallization of public opinion; it is supposed to reflect the common standards of the community. So long as these standards are nebulous the force of law is of little account, but when public opinion becomes sufficiently uniform to be capable of universal application—as is evidenced ordinarily by the passage of laws by a legislature or congress—law is bound to result.

This being so, it follows that the solution of the injunction problem lies in a re-allocation of the subject matters of law and equity. The extraordinary remedy which was validly applicable toward the close of the nineteenth century when the first injunction was issued in a labor dispute in this country, ought by this time to have been regularized. Strikes, lockouts, picketing, blacklists and boycotts are no longer extraordinary. They are part and parcel of our industrial system and must be expected to continue so long as our present system lasts. To use an extraordinary legal instrument to take care of them, then, is an anachronism. "Government by injunction" should give way to the more democratic government by laws. To expect "that this shall be a government of laws and not of men" in the broadest sense of that phrase is undoubtedly visionary. Yet that aspiration has a justifiable meaning, too, when it is taken to mean that for the petty whims and dislikes of persons in authority shall be substituted the principle of uniform justice. Laws are more amenable to the public will; they are more easily within the reach of public opinion than are the decisions of the judge on the bench. And when that judge administers an anachronistic instrument we may well ask ourselves whether it is a court of equity into which labor finds itself forced by its opponents.

The objections, then, to the use of the injunction in labor disputes are its irresponsibility to the opinion of the community, its continued use when that opinion has been expressed in the form of laws, and the autocracy and lack of justice which proceed from its use in this manner.

T. Richard Witmer.
Columbia University.

How to Find God

I

Imagine a world without a God, and see what follows. Without God the universe has no meaning, even the starry heavens reveal no intelligence. Without God the evolutionary process manifest throughout the universe, is a mere chance thing, blind, without purpose, containing no assurance even of continuation, liable by the same chance that brought it into existence to break down at any moment and come to an end. Without God man's reason cannot be accounted for, and cannot be trusted, because there is no answering reason in nature. Without God man's ideals are empty air and his faith's feet stand on nothing. Without God immortality fades away, man becomes only a superior brute, and death speedily swallows up all.

But with God, a real God, of infinite power, wisdom and love—the God affirmed by every faculty of the human soul—the universe blazes with intelligence; the evolutionary process instead of being a blind accident signifying nothing, is God's sublime creative plan marching majestically through the ages, to the achievement of ends greater, higher, more wonderful, more magnificent than the word or dream of any finite being can measure. And man, instead of being a mere bubble floating for a moment on a stream of blind forces that "Know not and care not," is, he has a right to believe, the purposed culmination and crown of the whole evolutionary process in this world, and in some true, deep, real, glorious sense a child of God; and because a child of God, therefore an inheritor of an immortality inseparable from that of God himself.

II

When I am asked, Where is God? or how to find God, I like best to answer: Look for him in nature and in your own soul as these are interpreted not by our theologians or by some of the duller-eyed of our scientists, but by our better, our deeper seeing poets. For example: Go into your closet alone, or out under the still heavens at night and with quiet earnestness repeat to yourself the two following short poems, and see if they do not open your eyes, the eyes of your deeper and truer self—to a spirit, a presence, a reality, indescribable but undeniable, kin to yourself yet infinitely greater and higher than yourself, that you cannot possibly escape, and would not if you could, and that you are unable to call by any lower or other name than God.

Who Thou art I know not,
But this much I know;
Thou has set the Pleiades
In a silver row;

Thou hast sent the trackless winds,
Loose upon their way;
Thou hast reared a colored wall
'Twixt the night and day;

Thou hast made the flowers to blow,
And the stars to shine,
Hid rare gems and richest ore
In the tunneled mine.

But, chief of all thy wondrous works,
Supreme of all thy plan,
Thou has put an upward reach
In the heart of Man!

—*Harry Kemp.*

There is enough of God
In the heart of a rose,
In the smile of a child,
In the dewy blossoms of dawn,
To prove
That beauty is the soul of Him,
That love is His sceptor,
And that all things created by Him
Do face, not the night,
But *Eternal Morning.*

—*Author Unknown.*

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day here published for the first time in English*]

XIX

1.

Often people think that they believe in the law of God when they only believe in what everyone else believes. Everyone else, however, does not believe in the law of God, but calls that the law of God which suits his life and does not interfere with him in leading it.

2.

When people believe blindly in that teaching which they give out as the law of God, they deprive themselves of the God-given capacity of reason, by which alone they can know the true law of God.

3.

Every faith says, each for itself, that it alone is the true faith, and that all the others are false. This in itself is enough for us to see that not one of these faiths is, or can be, the true faith. The true faith can only be that upon which all are agreed.

4.

If people live in sin and temptations, they cannot be at peace. Conscience reproaches them. Such people must choose one of two things: either admit themselves at fault before God and men and cease to sin; or continue to lead a sinful life, do evil deeds and call their evil deeds good. Just for such people was invented that doctrine of faith according to which it is possible for them, while living an evil life, to consider themselves in the right.

5.

Faith teaches people how to understand life. Many thousands of years ago people did not know and did not understand that which people of our times understand; and, therefore, much of that faith which was preached in ancient times, is no longer suitable for us. But with us, children learn precisely this ancient faith; for people think that everything in it is true, because it is old. This is a great mistake.

If in childhood a person is given untrue answers to the questions natural to his soul, the grown person either ceases to think of these most important questions of life; or, if he remembers the false answers to these questions given him in childhood, he devises ingenious explanations of that which cannot be true.

And, therefore, do not say to one whom you are bringing up (and especially do not give out as sacred and indisputable truth) either anything in which you quite disbelieve, or even anything which you doubt. To act thus is a great crime.

6.

There are people who take on themselves the right to decide for others their relationship to God and to the world; and there are people, the great majority, who give over this right to others and blindly believe in that which is told them. Both are equally criminal and pitiful.

7.

There is great evil and falsehood in the teaching of various faiths to children by the people who hold those faiths. To teach children one's own faith, which is not in accordance with the faiths of other nations is one of those offenses against children, concerning which Christ said that they bring the world to destruction. What right have we to teach as the truth that which is disputed by milliards of people? The only thing which we may and should teach children are those truths which are common to all peoples of the world.

XX

1.

People often think that the more one knows, the better. This is untrue. The point is, not to know much, but to know that which is most necessary of all that can be known.

2.

Socrates, the sage, said that stupidity consists, not in knowing little, but in not knowing one's own self and in thinking that one knows that which one does not know. This he called both stupidity and ignorance.

3.

Owls see in the dark, but are blind in the daylight. The same things happen with learned people. They know a great deal of unnecessary scientific nonsense, but they do not and cannot know anything of that which is most important for life: of how man must live in the world.

4.

Just as there is false teaching in religion, so there is false teaching in science. This false teaching consists in recognizing as the one true science, that which is considered true science at the moment by people who usurp the right of defining true science. But when science is considered, not as that which is necessary to all men, but as that which is defined by people who have usurped this right, then science cannot but be false. And thus it has come to pass in our world.

5.

Science in our time occupies precisely that place which the church occupied two or three hundred years ago: the same recognized priests—the professors; the same cathedrals and synods in science—academies, universities, conventions; the same trust and absence of criticism; the same dissensions, which do not embarrass the believers; the same incomprehensible words instead of thought and the same self-confident pride.

"What's the use of talking to him,—he denies revelation, the Church."

"What's the use of talking to him,—he denies *science*."

6.

That which is called science with us is almost entirely a mere invention of rich people, which they need to occupy their idle time.

7.

If a man knows all sciences and speaks in all tongues, but is ignorant as to what is this infinite world in the midst of which he lives; and does not know, above all, for what purpose he lives and what is required of him; then he is far less enlightened than that illiterate old woman who believes in God, by whose will she recognizes herself as living, and who knows that this God requires righteousness of her. She is more enlightened than the scholar because she has an answer to the main question: what is her life, and how must she live? The scholar, however, while he has the most ingenious answers to the most complicated, but unimportant questions of life, has no answer to the main question of every rational man: for what purpose do I live, and what must I do?

8.

The Egyptian did not regard all the propositions which the priests presented to him for the truth as we regard them—that is, as beliefs—but regarded them as revelations of the highest knowledge available to man; that is, as science. And just so, at the present time, simple people, ignorant of science, regard that which is given out to them by the present priests of science for the indisputable truth: they believe in it.

XXI

1.

For man it is dearest of all to be free, to live by his own, and not an alien will. In order to live thus, man must live for the soul; and to live for the soul, he must make an effort to put down the lusts of his body.

2.

Sins, temptations and superstitions hide the soul of man from himself. In order to reveal his soul to himself, man must make an effort. In these efforts to overcome sins, temptations, superstitions and delusions lies the main business of every man's life.

3.

Virtue consists only in doing what we ought. Effort is always necessary to do what we ought. If we do good without effort, from habit, this is not virtue. A virtuous man always progresses; and in order to progress, there must always be effort.

4.

People often think that in order to be a true Christian one must do exceptional, unusual deeds. But for Christianity no exceptional, unusual deeds are necessary, but only incessant efforts to free oneself from sins, temptations, superstitions and delusions.

5.

Lessing said that it is not truth which gives man joy, but the attainment of it. And the same may be said of virtue: it is not virtue which is dear, but the approach to virtue through effort.

6.

Life is an incessant struggle between body and spirit. The body divides, the spirit unites. In the struggle between body and spirit, spirit always conquers,—but this conquest is never final. The body again attacks the spirit and seeks to divide, but the spirit conquers it once more. And with every new attack the body grows weaker and weaker, the spirit stronger and stronger.

[To be continued]

The Study Table

An Englishman on India

An American, fed in his youth upon the historic story of the American Revolution as written by Americans, acquires a prejudiced view against England and the English people which follows him all through life. It is easy, therefore, for him to believe that wherever there is conflict of opinion between the English and any other people, England must of verity be in the wrong, she having been so very wrong, in our judgment, not only in revolutionary days but in subsequent conflicts, also.

And so it is not difficult for the average American to give great credit to the claims being made now by India, and to translate her struggle for freedom into terms of our own struggle at the birth of our great Nation. Moreover, it is not to be expected by the American mind that any Englishman could be so frank, honest, judicial and faithful to truth itself as to give an unbiased opinion of the situation which he witnesses on the world stage today with England and India as the chief actors.

This, however, has been splendidly done by an Englishman who not only is an officer in his Majesty's service, but one who bears the honorable title after his name of D. S. O., the initials more to be coveted than riches, for they tell the story of distinguished services rendered the mother country.

"Must England Lose India"* written by a British officer of the Order of Distinguished Service, comes as a very satisfying surprise and marks the author as one of those fine types of humanity set apart from the rest by their ability to reverence truth more than all other things.

Lt. Col. Osburn's work has been for England, and he is so intensely loyal to her, loves her so much and so disinterestedly that he dares to her face to speak the truth about her as he sees it. He dares to hold up before her no doubt astonished eyes a picture of herself as experience has shown her to him and as observation has shown her reflected in the eyes and the mental attitudes of an onlooking world. It is perhaps true that that world sees with a more or less warped national vision. The author, if he thought of that, waived the fact, and set about to search out the truth and justice of the criticisms and reactions that he had found, fully realizing that the situation requires a careful sifting of all evidence.

The book opens with this picture:

"Mother India—warm, untidy, sensual perhaps, and much

*"Must England Lose India," by Lt.-Col. Arthur Osburn, D.S.O. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. $3.00.

too prolific. Too dreamy. Confused with her problems, but yet with all her failings a warm, brown-skinned mother.

"Step-Mother England—the stern, cold, white-faced, censorious school-marm. Thin-lipped, self-righteous, exacting, misunderstanding—with a whip in her hand!

"Always a threat upon her lips and a whip in her hand—scolding.

"A shadow of glum disapproval that leans over Asia.

"And always that whip!

"This is how the Indian thinks and feels.

"Which will the Indian choose?"

Then the author adds:

This book—at once a criticism, a confession, and an appeal—is written with but one motive: to suggest what are the true reasons for our growing difficulties in India, and, by drawing attention to the causes of the present discontent in that unhappy country and to certain possible remedies, to delay or prevent the demand in India for Independence or Home Rule from becoming irresistible.

From this, one decides that Lieutenant-Colonel Osburn believes that India, with abuses of government removed, would be better off under the *aegis* of England. Perhaps most people who think about the matter at all agree with him in this belief.

The theme of the book is the reaction that has come to the Indian people themselves from a hundred and eighty years of British supremacy in India. He finds that reaction bad, and that it has come to assume the proportions of a menace to England's empire, and that the causes are nothing more or less than the "Superiority Complex" which the world in general observes in the vast majority of the members of the English ruling class, and which he, himself a member of that class by birth and education, has seen at its deadly work in India. This disastrous "Superiority Complex" he traces very directly to the influence of the Public Schools of England—those preparatory schools like Eton and Harrow which establish the foundations of the future character of the sons of the governing classes, both military and civil.

Getting down to the root of the matter, the author shows how boys are brutalized, made rude, cruel and vindictive even among themselves, by the treatment they receive upon entry into these schools, and which they, Form by Form, perpetuate in turn as the years roll by, because of the sacred Public School Traditions. He takes the stand that a boy who has been "hardened," as the defenders of the system call it, by harsh, coarse words and unmerited blows from boys but little older than himself—the *"prefects"* who rule under the Masters, and incidentally save those gentlemen much of the trouble of discipline—will naturally give abuse, contempt, and blows to those who come after him. The "hurt" boy's heart acquires a "get even" complex before he knows it, and when his turn comes to be *"prefect"* he *gets even,* and when he leaves school to enter active life he carries with him the tradition that it is the correct thing to bully the little fellow. What is he little for, if not to be made to keep his "cheek" in abeyance? And isn't any usurpation of equal rights in a man who isn't big enough to knock one down "cheek?" Being used to hearing the sons of their fathers and of their fathers' peers called "dirty beggars" and "silly asses," with the epithet reinforced by a kick or a blow, what more natural than that such boys should perpetuate this manner of dealing with others when they become governors of provinces, or generals in the military arm of His Majesty's service in the outlying countries that have been taken by force, and held by might and strategy?

The author says that this system of ill-treatment of weaker persons that began in the Public Schools, the English military and civil official carries with him to the work of administering England's affairs in her provinces. Of all these provinces subject to the British supervision, India is the outstanding example of patient endurance, in that India has not, until now, demanded, as have the other colonies, self-government. This backwardness he attributes to the naturally patient nature of the Indian people, and to their extreme helplessness and poverty. He is convinced that the insults and degradation which result from the contemptuous and rude treatment of the Englishmen in India, are more galling to the spirit of the slowly awakening Indians than the heavy taxation which starves their bodies, although that heavy taxation he also considers unjust because the revenues raised by taxation are used rather to maintain an army within the borders of the country, and to pay extremely high salaries to the officers who administer it and the civil government, than for the development of those things which would make for the betterment of the whole people native to India, and because of the fact that the share of these revenues which falls to the lot of the English is spent largely outside of India.

"Why do not the Indians revolt?" For the above given reasons, and, as the author finds, because they are so completely demoralized by the system of "divide and rule" which, perpetuating hate among different races and states and religionists, has here, as always elsewhere, proven a mighty source of power to all conquering and forcefully-holding nations. He sees Machiavellian subtlety at work in the permitting of cruelty and the exacting of bribes on the part of the native police. It creates a fierce hatred of the police which makes them afraid to revolt from the English control lest their own countrymen fall upon them. He admits that cruelty and oppression are rather a tendency among Oriental officials, but thinks their sweet privilege should be sternly curbed. Such education as the present day Oriental has had has made him naturally cruel, for it has long been an education in war and strife and pillage, and from the official standpoint, safety for the British Government is seen in fostering this hatred between the people and the police, so that the police is upheld even in the face of just complaints from the people.

Lieutenant-Colonel Osburn gives many examples of misuse of authority, and attacks the governmental policy which makes it illegal for the villager to own firearms, since, of all people, he most needs them to protect his life and the lives of his women and children from the wild creatures that prey upon them. The Indian cultivator of the land lives not only in dread of the police who exact bribes, of tax-collectors who "squeeze" his poor cash earnings, of the Englishman who kicks him, and of starvation, famine and disease, but also of wild beasts. And not alone of the man-eating tigers, and the like, is he in dread, but of the wild antelopes and pigs that are preserved for the pleasure of sportsmen, which come to the fields to trample down and feed upon his growing crops. The author thinks that either the villagers should be given means to defend themselves, or that the government should establish a way of ridding the country of these pests and dangers, if for no other reason than that it would give relief to the little children who, as things

now are, must act as night "scarecrows," standing upon platforms erected in the fields and keeping awake all night to scare away with their cries and clamor the flocks of birds and the predatory animals: afraid to go to sleep, and afraid to leave the platforms lest they themselves be eaten! He speaks of the pitifulness of their small hoarse voices still striving to keep up the alarm when morning comes to release them to a day-time of sleep.

The book teems with examples bearing witness to the charges of misgovernment because of a lack of sympathetic understanding of the country's peculiar needs, which is carried so far that it becomes callous indifference on the part of the English officials. It speaks of the deadening effect such sights have upon what sympathy and humanity their Public School training has left to these men. He is convinced that after a few years' service in India, the majority of the returning officials and commercialists would kick the English laborer quite willingly when irritated by some inconsequential stupidity, if it were not for the law and public opinion. He asserts that the men of the working classes in England detect this tendency, and that only its prompt and complete suppression can prevent revolution in the Motherland.

The author makes very reasonable excuses for the sex complications existing among Indians. He cites the climate, underfeeding, lack of all wholesome amusement, the housing of many persons in small rooms, scanty clothing, and not too much intelligence among the masses, as reasons why there is—*if* there is, which he seems somewhat to doubt—more self-indulgence in promiscuous sex vice among them than among Europeans. He admits that vice is more openly indulged in, however; but cites the fact that whatever happens to be a nation's pet immorality—aversion—as sex vice is the pet immorality-aversion of puritanical England—is apt to be overworked as a reason why an alien and subjected people should not be given the right to govern itself. He finds without reserve that the "beam" of greed, selfishness, deceptive dealing, and contempt for the rights of fellow human beings in the eye of the English quite outweighs the "mote" of sexual immorality in the case of the Indian eye—especially considering relative opportunities for living a well-rounded life. I quote from the book:

In "Mother India" and "The Slaves of the Gods," great stress is laid on the misery, poverty, degradation, lack of sanitation and general backwardness of India. Much is said concerning the want of education and sexual immorality. Oddly enough it appears that English officials in India gave the American author every opportunity for collecting statistics of vice, crime, indecency, unnatural offenses and other forms of immorality. This side of the subject is written up in a lurid and somewhat exaggerated fashion. Naturally such a book would sell like hot cakes in the United States, and naturally—surely the English officials must have thought of this—the book provokes reflection in America that if this is the state of India after the English have been there for one hundred and eighty years, it is high time that we left India! One did not realize that officials in India were so anxious to curtail the duration of our control there! At least this American author will have compelled us to treble or quadruple the amount spent on education and sanitation in India and proportionately reduce the amount we spend on the Indian Army and its allied services. This may not be a bad thing.

Relative to police enormities, I quote again:

Sir Valentine Chirol's account of the ghastly massacre at Amritsar takes one back to the "Frightfulness" of the days when, after the Indian Mutiny, Indian soldiers were lashed by the English to the muzzle of their cannon and blown to pieces. We English change but slowly; the Crawling Order and even the brutality of Pondanur are evidence that the attitude of the average Englishman in India to the Indian remains much the same. Because an English missionary was "insulted" the inhabitants of one of the largest of Indian cities were compelled by the British officers to crawl upon their bellies whenever they passed through the street where this had occurred. Not the perpetrators of the "insult" but old men, women and little children, absolutely innocent of any offense and entirely ignorant as to the reason of this monstrous indignity forced upon them in their own country. The Public School-boyishness of this amazing order is obvious. It is the "Third Form Mind" of a second-rate Public School monkeying with the pivot of our Trade, which is the "goodwill" of India and the Far East.

One wonders whether that missionary ever heard about turning the other cheek!

The author says:

But mainly this book is an appeal, not to the English nation as a whole, of whom the great bulk are neither Negrophobe nor arrogant—but rather to the English governing classes to drop a little of their stupid arrogance and racial and caste snobbery, if only for the sake of that great heterogeneous "Empire" about which they are always shouting, but which they are constantly doing their very best to make unpopular and consequently insecure.

One cannot forbear to quote the author on the subject of games as a compulsory branch of English Public School education. He says:

It is supposed that the playing of games and the much belauded discipline of "team work" act as an antidote. (To the school-boy's domination complex.) But why do we deny that one of the main objects of games is to defeat—and just that much humiliate—our fellow-men, and so proportionately increase our own pride and self-confidence, qualities by no means already lacking in the average young Englishman of the Public School class. The team spirit—so unattractive to us when it shows itself in the discipline of the wolf-pack or in the combination of a gang of cat burglars—has of course its good co-operative side; it also works as a form of *esprit de corps* against inconvenient questions in the House of Commons, as we discovered during the Irish Rebellion.

Here are a few sayings to be found in the book which it might be well to remember:

Contemptuous abuse, we are assured, breaks no bones; but does it not, even when used unthinkingly, have any effect upon the user?

. . . . .

A heart roughly and bitterly disillusioned in childhood never quite recovers its sensibility to injustice, its natural frankness and generosity.

. . . . .

The bully is at least as anti-social as the voluptuary.

. . . . .

We English Traditionalists need to be reminded that nearly all the greatest characters in history were either non-conformists or Agitators; some of the very greatest were both. It was Christ and not Satan who was the rebel against the pretensions of the High Priest, the Imperialist ambitions of Pagan Rome, and the conventional "good form" of his time.

. . . . .

Indeed, he who "would walk with God"—and the Truth—must often walk alone! It is a truism to say of all great assemblies, whether they be public schools or congregations or parliaments, that it is the Lowest Common Denominator that rules the roost and not—alas!—the Highest Common Factor.

Of police abuses of the power given them, he says:

The obvious remedy under present conditions is for the Indian police to have less power and very much stricter supervision.

Of the cultivators' grievances:

Another stupidity is the common practice of trying to replace native methods by introducing expensive apparatus from Europe.

. . . . .

They are the real Bolsheviks who encourage an attitude of mind that must provoke Bolshevism and discontent in others.

Then comes the pertinent question apropos of disarmament:

Why do our governing classes pretend that they have

any sympathy for the abolition of War—when in private the idea is so often ridiculed?

The author shows by citing examples that have fallen under his observation, how difficult it is for a young Englishman, no matter what may be his personal inclination, to act with consideration for the native Indian. He is promptly labeled a "pro-Indian" and "cut" by all the society he has, the Club society of the Official English in India. The policy of the older generations of rulers has to be bowed to, or the young man finds himself a social outcast.

Lieutenant-Colonel Osburn has given the outline of eighteen reformatory measures that he recommends for the government of India. These touch many grievances. They recommend themselves as logical, and have to do with such practical things as compelling every Englishman who is desirous of taking up work in India to pass a test showing that he has some elementary knowledge of Indian history and the two main religions; the abolition of the use of terms of contempt. He says that to insult Indians in India should be considered a serious matter, and that the punishment for striking an Indian should be made the same as that inflicted in the Army for striking a soldier. He recommends removal from India, after a period of probation, of Europeans temperamentally unsuited for work among strange or colored races, and says:

The over-irritable Englishman, whether an official in Delhi, or a business man in Calcutta, a nuisance anywhere, is a positive danger in our tropical dependencies. The Negrophobe must go!

On shipping grain out of India:

Prohibition of the export of food-stuffs until the price of food has fallen so far that there is a danger of food being wasted should be made a law.

On the difficulties arising from misunderstanding the language:

A test should be passed in the language of the Province in which a man is to work after he has been six months in India.

These, and a reduction of taxes, are among the eighteen reforms suggested.

The reader is impressed all through with the immense honesty and earnestness and the real patriotism of the author of "Must England Lose India?" and with the bravery of the man who so dares stand for his convictions in the face of the disapproval of his own caste. And to seriously suggest the abolition of the sacred Public Schools and the compulsory attendance at the National Schools by all classes of English boys—that surely required courage!

To one who, like this reviewer, has rather looked to England to give finally to the world justice and stability and cheerfully obeyed laws, this is a very disheartening book. Has America no (unofficial) influence to bring to bear to save her foolish, misguided, obstinate old Mother England? A grown child, independently "on her own," sane and well-intentioned, should, it would seem, be justified in saying (unofficially, *bien entendu*):

Hold hard, Mother! You're making a hideous row in your sleep! Better wake up, Old Dear, you'll do yourself a hurt gritting your teeth like that; they're artificial, you know!

L. M. G.

Correspondence

Britain, Palestine, and India

Editor of UNITY:

British decision regarding Palestine must have jarred the complacency of some of the Jewish friends who swore by the honesty and nobility of the British government. British declaration on Palestine on the very eve of the opening of the Round Table Conference on India has a peculiar sinister significance. It will aid the Aga Khan and others to sow the seeds of discord among Indians. But I expected it long ago.

I hope that the Jews will not be misled by the letter signed by Baldwin, Amery and Chamberlain. The Conservatives were for the same policy in favor of the Arabs against the Jews. If anyone has any doubt then he should carefully read various utterances of Lord Winterton and others. I venture to say that the present British High Commissioner is a Conservative. To be sure, the Liberals—who have used Jewish money for political purposes—and the Conservatives will attack the Labor Government on the Palestine issue. But these attacks should not be regarded as genuine sympathy for the Jews or any desire to change the fundamentals of British policy in Palestine. The Labor Government might be overthrown but the policy enunciated will remain in force.

Let me be concrete and cite an example which may be more convincing than my bare statement. Disraeli's Egyptian policy was attacked by Gladstone and other Liberals. But Blunt clearly shows that Gladstone's Egyptian policy was no less imperialistic. Later on the Liberals under Lloyd George recognized the so-called independence of Egypt, but MacDonald made the definite reservations in his note to Zagbul Pasha which note is the foundation of the British policy in Egypt. Mr. MacDonald attacked the Tories and Liberals on Indian policy, but he has inaugurated the most barbarous of the British regimes in India.

If anyone unbiasedly studies the history of British policy in Palestine or the Near East, these facts will be clear: (1) The British wished to secure control over the whole region from the Suez to the border of India by one way or another. (2) One of the causes of the World War was the British opposition to the Berlin Bagdad railway and British desire to bring about destruction of a strong Turkey allied with Germany. (3) The British made secret treaties with the French and Italians for the partition of the Near East, and later on broke these treaties. (4) The British fomented the Arab Revolt; spent several hundred millions of pounds for it and made a secret agreement contrary to their treaty with France (Sykes-Picot Agreement). (5) Then they promised the Jews by the Balfour Declaration something which they never intended to carry out.

If one wishes to get a good idea of the British policy in the Near East then the "King-Crane Report" will give some light on it. When the British found that the French could not be ousted from Syria, *the British subsidized Emir Feisal with money and arms so that the French might be ousted.* This failed because of the determination of the French to fight back and who *aided the Turks with arms, etc.,* which brought the disastrous results to the Greek army by the forces of Mustapha Kemal Pasha. At the same time the British did their best to disrupt the Arab forces by aiding both parties in the Arab Civil War—the British aided Emir Feisal as well as Ibn Saud, who were fighting for supremacy. Later on the British have established kindly relations with these rulers and have signed an effective alliance with Emir Feisal by a treaty with the King of Iraq. Now the established policy is to aid the Arabs and use them for British imperial purposes.

It is well known and recognized that Col. Lawrence was at the root of the Afghan Revolution to weaken Afghanistan and to destroy the power of Amanullah who was an advocate of Afghan-Persian-Turkish alliance and co-operation with Soviet Russia. Furthermore, it is generally suspected that Col. Lawrence is now engaged in promoting *Khurd Rebellion* against Turks. There is no question about the fact that the Khurds have secured arms from British sources.

The British needed Jewish support to induce Jewish bankers and others to take active part against Germany during the World War. Now the British wish to retain Arab and Moslem support to master the situation in the

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Two Australian Prophets

[Following are two messages from Australia; one is by Dr. Charles Strong, Melbourne, Australian correspondent of UNITY, given at the forty-fifth anniversary of the Australian Church, of which he was founder and has been pastor all these years. He writes: "It is wonderful what changes are coming over us, and, I hope, in us. I wish religious peace could be secured. Labor is in full swing in both Parliaments here. I hope it will manage to stick in, for its program seems to be in the right direction."

The other message is from Rev. A. Rivett, editor of the *Federal Independent,* Sydney. He has been for thirty years an intrepid champion of intelligence and freedom.—Editor.]

Dr. Charles Strong

On the eleventh of this month of November, 1885, the Australian Church was founded at a meeting of a congregation that for some time had been worshipping in the Temperance Hall, Russell Street.

A new generation has arisen that knows nothing of the origin of the Church and the controversies out of which it arose.

What are its principles? some may ask.

Let me try to answer this question as simply as possible.

(a) One of the fundamental principles may be said to be the spiritual nature of religion.

Religion has its foundation in the human soul, in our rational and spiritual nature, not in differing historical and theological beliefs received on authority. It is essentially a spiritual trust in God as love, and a life, the practical life, that flows out of such trust and hope.

(b) Christian religion is in the second place, Evolutionary.

The modern Protestant view is that the ideal of the religious life is always growing; as it were breaking the old husk or shell of less enlightened times, and carrying out the hidden principle to fuller and fuller realization.

According to the evolutionary view, truth is still being revealed, God is still speaking in the soul of man to those who will listen, still more fully revealing himself. Dogmatics and ritual, which perhaps, at a certain state of Christian evolution, served a purpose, have to drop off as knowledge, thought, experience, and love expand.

(c) A third principle may be said to be that a Christian Church is a body of people united in One Spirit, not in one system of historical and theological belief, or in one Divinely appointed form of ritual.

(d) This brings me to my last thought. That a true Christian Church cannot be a sect. Its aim is the evolution of a Universal Church of the Spirit—a spirit that animates all true Christians and makes them brothers and sisters.

Try to imagine the power which such a spiritual world-Church might have over mankind!

Let us now, in conclusion, ask what prospect there is of such an ideal of the Christian Church being carried out? Are there signs of the coming of such a Church?

The prospect is not always very bright, and great obstacles block the way. Among these obstacles are vested interests, the power of tradition, fear of the hereafter, ignorance, thoughtlessness, selfish indifference and minds and hearts given up to things seen and temporal.

And yet there are "glimpses," as Wordsworth says, "that make us less forlorn," which may be caught by those who look below the surface. The old theology of "orthodoxy" and the old view of history, and the old conception of the material and physical world, of God and of man's relation to God and God's relation to man have all been gradually crumbling away. Beneath the surface, sometimes subconsciously, great changes have been and are going on. We can't help it. Struggle against it, as men may, the tide is no respector of persons. The utterances of leading men today, even of those within orthodox churches, or their significant silence, the drift of much religious literature, and the alienation of so many from churches, both Protestant and Catholic, or the multiplication of new cults, and the very expulsion of "modernists" from the Roman Church, and the war waged by Anglo-Catholics and Fundamentalists, are signs of the times and the change of wind. And then there are the Church Conferences that are being held, and the movements toward union of churches, the spread of education, and such a Conference as that of representatives of all the religions of the world to be held in 1931 on how to abolish war, and for which careful preparation is now being made.

Before a change in the weather comes you feel often that the change

---

Near East and Indian, and the Jews are thrown overboard.

Some people suspect that the Arab rising against the Jews was secretly aided by the British, as the Moslem assault on Hindus in India is often aided and promoted by British officials in Indian. Arab massacre of the Jews has afforded the British an opportunity to further their own end, which will be against the Arabs and the Jews as well. This is to be seen from the report of Sir John Hope Simpson, who recommends *to increase British air forces, infantry brigades and armored cars, and armed police in Palestine, which might be used in "any emergency"* (against Egypt, Turkey, France in Syria or Arabia). It also recommends to establish the *legislative council of the type* which existed in India in 1905—a quarter century ago. This report fears that there will be a non-co-operative movement in Palestine, and therefore it takes the precaution of appointing twelve non-official members of the Legislative Council, if the election is boycotted.

Jews who swear by the honesty of Great Britain will learn their lesson. But will the Jews learn the lesson that as long as India remains under the British rule there will be no freedom for any people in the Near East? Freedom of India is the key to the future of world-settlement with justice and freedom.

TARAKNATH DAS.

A Personal Word from Gandhi

Dear Brother:

. . . News from Gandhiji continues to be good. In his letter to me this week he says his weight has gone up a pound, now being 105 lbs. For him that is quite a good weight.

As you may know, Gandhiji has had no interviews with his friends and relatives for some six months. He submitted to the Government a list of the people he would wish to be able to meet at intervals. He does not recognize blood relationship, or shall I say he recognizes all as equal to blood relations, and thus explained that if he could not see the people named on the list he would not be able to allow himself to see anybody. The Government refused the list and so none of us can see him. But he may send one envelope a week to the Ashram, in which he may put many little notes. He writes each week some 40 to 50 little notes, to two or three of us a longer letter, and a general letter to the Ashram, together with his weekly discourse on some moral subject. And we, in return may send one envelope a week from here in which we enclose the letters and notes of many friends.

Bapu (this is what we call him in the Ashram—it means father)—writes: "We can only gain by self-denial. Therefore there need be no heart-burning over this stoppage of interviews. It is better that spirit meet spirit. No power on earth can stop that blessed contact." Gandhiji is daily spinning some 500 yards of fine yarn and also carding his own cotton.

Ahmedabad, India MIRA

Thoughts of Tolstoy

Editor of UNITY:

What a glorious man was Tolstoy! Not faultless, but noble, great; a true and fearless teacher, strong and beautiful as a sunlit mountain. No wonder Chesterton said when he died, "A tower has fallen." I am again brought back to the grandeur of Tolstoy through the selections printed in UNITY . . . I greatly enjoy UNITY. It expounds and defends universal truth and punctures many a shining bubble of our time.

Brookline, Mass. SHEED ANDERSON

is coming, and the scientific weather-prophet can tell you what to expect. It is somewhat the same with regard to the changes in the spiritual weather. It is not, however, merely that the old is passing away, but that faith and hope and love are felt to be evolving and taking new and larger forms of expression. It is not enough that old things are passing away. Churches have to be made new, and we have to make them new. For spiritual evolution needs spiritual wills and personalities, and united efforts of those who are "looking for the Kingdom of God." That Kingdom comes not with observation, but by silent changes such as take place in the seed before it declares itself in the blade, and ear, and full corn in the ear.

* * *

Rev. A. Rivett

On the World's Necessity—A Rediscovered Christ

An English writer was recently quoted in S. M. *Herald* as saying: "The unrighteous profiteer and the iniquitous politician are more afraid of Ramsay MacDonald or Eugene Debs than they are of the whole church of Jesus Christ." Debs is dead, crucified by Christian America for condemning the war, and the church of Jesus Christ remains a very ambiguous quantity. The churches at one time did possess some moral power in the community, and not so long ago. Even up to the war in 1914 they had a standing—a position, however, which their attitude to the war has destroyed, and which since they have never regained.

It would be well if, as churches, we faced right up to the question, What IS our job, and are we accomplishing it, and if not why not? There are some jobs which men become too respectable to tackle, too dilettante. There are some jobs which require that men take off their coats and dig in. The work of human redemption is such. It is not a harmless pastime in which ecclesiastics can indulge and know nothing of perspiration. It is not enough to adorn a class in all kinds of millinery and sing of "fighting the good fight with all thy might," when there is no might in it, and less fight. The ministry has become with many more or less of a sinecure. The job is easy and stipends are assured, so why worry? Some politicians of our acquaintance were once fiery propagandists until they achieved a position of safety and affluence in a parliamentary seat—then the fire went out and they have since become respectably cold. That's the peril.

Organized Christianity must experience an inward revolution or become increasingly effete. Its ultimate victory lies not along existing ecclesiastical lines. Whenever there has been a lift of life or a lift forward it has been by men who have dared to get outside the organism and be regarded as irregulars. To speak of the church or churches as being a militant marching force is to provoke a smile of simplicity. Where is the attack felt? When the speaker was a youngster many preachers preached in kid gloves. Spurgeon referred to the practice and urged his students to get rid of the gloves, for, he said, "Cats in mittens catch no mice." Many ministers still stick to the mittens—gloves of hesitancy, softness, fear. No profiteer need be nervy about occupying a front seat in many churches for fear that the preacher's text should be that of the prophet Nathan to guilty David, "Thou art the man!"

A converted church would quickly get into the same grim holts with the hypocrisies of the age as did the Christ. Thirty or more years ago the speaker came across the following from Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, and it has never left him:

"Christ was the educated and sanctified Socialist. He was the consistent democrat. He was the consecrated agitator. Social rank simply did not exist for him. Caste he scorned. A fisherman was his most intimate friend. He accepted the hospitality of an ostracized man. He conversed fearlessly and naturally with abandoned women. He did not refuse to penitent outcasts the preciousness of his personal friendship. He was never known to shrink from foul diseases. Vulgar natures he treated with the patience of high refinement. The 'common people' loved him. He denounced the fashionable shams of his times with the nonchalance of an emperor and the intelligence of an artisan. He scathed the petty pretensions of the leaders of society with that indifference to criticism characteristic of high birth, and that sympathy with what we call the 'lower classes' incident to a personal experience of poverty. His social theories held the relentlessness of love. There is no polite way of evading them. There is no well-bred opportunity of ignoring them. The Christianity of Christ must meet them point-blank. They are its essential test. They are the first and final demand."

This Christ is not outworn. He needs to be re-discovered and re-presented. A re-discovered Christ, re-presented by a re-converted church would go far to effect a re-constituted society.

Chateau de Bures

par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For Information address
EDWIN CORNELL ZAVITZ, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

IN DECEMBER
The holidays, with their rounds of entertainments and festivities, make extraordinary demands upon evening wardrobes. While here is a service which can be depended on to beautifully cleanse and condition each dress garment entrusted to its care.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.
THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO